6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

178 In the new secularized and urbanized society, also, the position
565 of the clergy became increasingly precarious. Like other insti-
793 tutions of the Czardom the Russian Orthodox Church was organ-
ized along the lines of sharp social differentiation and domi-
nance-submission relationships. Russian Orthodox clergy as a
whole formed a closed caste institution. All lay clergymen and
many monastics were recruited from among the members of the
[582] families of lay clergy. Endogamous marriage was practiced
within this caste. The church maintained its own schools for
both the sons and the daughters of clergymen. In this manner
●[184] the clergy had been separated from the rest of the society and
had developed a sub-culture of its own. The clerics were set
apart from others not only by their priestly garb, but by their
manners, and even by their names.

792 Internally, however, within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy
793 there was a sharp distinction between the monastic order (black
554 clergy) and the secular priesthood (white clergy). The monastic
order was rich in land donations and other possessions and all
the Church hierarchy was recruited from among its ranks. The
secular clergy was not only subordinate to the monastics, but
also poor. Among the secular clergy sharp class distinction ex-
isted between the city clergy and the village priests. This dif-
ferentiation was manifested in the differences in income, educa-
tion and prestige, as well as in the lack of intermarriage between
these strata. The difference was also reflected in the attitudes of
[369] the laity. While the city clergy were socially accepted by the mid-
dle and lower urban layers, the village priests were rather iso-
lated from the rest of the population.

However, the sharpest difference and social distance existed between the Church hierarchy and the rank-and-file clergymen. The heads of monasteries, for instance, behaved like real magnates. They took in large revenues, kept servants, horses and carriages, and hardly shared in the life of their monastic brothers, even though these Church dignitaries resided in monasteries. In the same way, the bishops were inclined to belittle the lay clergy under their control. They treated them with a great want of respect. They would abuse them, insult them and then even flog them.

1 [i.e. developing in the second half of the XIXth century — Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

tion which had developed in Russia after the February revolution and to achieve their main objective.

II

Just as earlier, in Turco-Mongol empires, the great weakness of the Czardom lay in its low degree of emotional and ideological unity And it is this basic vulnerability of the Czardom which has enabled a small, but determined, well disciplined and ruthless faction of professional conspirators to seize power. Like its patriarchal family the whole Czardom was torn by internal dissension and strife. The abusive and humiliating power relationships at all levels of social organization of the Czardom encouraged self-orientation and destructive aggressiveness which precluded tolerance, compromise and social cohesion.

In such circumstances it was difficult to develop a set of common values that would serve as a focal point of unity of all subjects and keep the society unified in face of all threats to its existence. Orthodox religion, as well as Russian nationalism, failed in its role of unifying ideologies in a society in which interpersonal and intergroup relationships provoked feelings of rejection, mistrust, emotional instability and extreme factionalism. Thus, instead of developing itself into an integrated community unified by common feelings and identification and common interests, there grew within the Czardom a number of separate and inimical worlds with confiicting expectations and demands and with differing images and visions.

There was the world of the peasants, the world of the landlords, the world of the lower urban folk, the world of the clergy, the world of the bureaucracy, the world of the military, the world of the intelligentsia, the world of a small upper commercial and industrial class, and finally the separate worlds of ethnical, religious and national minorities. Since Russia had not developed a numerically strong and influential middle class to link and unify all these strata, there was little contact, less understanding and no mutual sympathy between these contrasting worlds. There were deep tensions and conflicts also within each one of these worlds and all were in a perpetual state of hostility and warfare among themselves.[11]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

The landed gentry had for ages kept the peasants in slavery, misery and contempt. The peasants, feeling humiliated and wronged, had risen against the landlords, burning manorial mansions, looting estates, and massacring their masters whenever the power of the nobility appeared to be waning. Since the traditions of Russian landed squires were those of service nobility, not of manorial aristocrats, their interests and ambitions did not prepare them to take a personal interest in either their lands or serfs. The mansions on the estates of these rural gentry were located on the outskirts of the peasant villages and except for the house servants there was little if any contact with the world of the peasantry. Since Peter the Great the differences between these two worlds became also very visible in dress, manners, standard of living, as well as in views of life, education, ideas and morals. When, after the reforms of Peter the Great, French ways were aped by the dvorianstvo, and French language accepted by them as a means of social intercourse, the abyss between the two worlds became even more unbridgeable.

Similarly the bureaucracy and the revolutionary intelligentsia were two violently opposed camps with little possibility of cooperation between them. And while secondary schools and the universities were producing increasing numbers of lawyers, teachers, architects, journalists, artists, and literati, the tension between the bureaucracy and these intelligentsia developed into an intense and open enmity. Extreme emotionalism nursed on the family level was only heightened in such conditions. Each of these groups therefore showed a great deal of dogmatism; they tended to be implacable, irreconcilable, and full of malevolent criticism of each other. To the revolutionary intelligentsia the bureaucrats were the "corrupted lackeys of the dynasts to be killed like beasts." To the government officials all the liberal intelligentsia were the "mortal enemies" of the Czar. They represented the "sedition" and had to be "mercilessly annihilated."[12] Thus while the intelligentsia relentlessly attacked the bureaucracy in a spirit of destructive criticism, the bureaucracy responded by persecuting the liberals and the revolutionaries with such a blind passion and hatred that the opposition had to go underground or emigrate abroad and organize its war from out-

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

184 565 side. The gulf between these two leading groups of the Czardom became impassable.

The intelligentsia themselves were far from being unified or having a common purpose. They were a restless and unstable crowd. They were split into numerous parties, factions and cliques which were in a perpetual state of feuding and warfare among themselves. Since all tended toward extremes and all sought absolute power, each party, faction, and clique considered itself to be the only repository of the Truth and therefore anathematized all others. Dogmatic intolerance and neverending feuding constantly fostered new schisms and heresies, new renegations and treacheries, bitterness, hostilities and extreme factional strife.

Both the peasants and the intelligentsia resented the military. The officers kept apart from the rest of society as a separate caste, and were therefore alienated from the common people. Within the military ranks there was a great deal of distrust and suspicion of common soldiers toward officers. The revolutionary intelligentsia considered the armed forces to be the main bulwark of the autocracy, showed a passionate hatred toward them and were waiting for the first chance to destroy this pillar of the old regime. All the strata of the population equally loathed the dreadful political police. The revolutionary intelligentsia were also distrustful of the clergy and Church hierarchy. Most of them were openly atheistic.

182 In want of an integrating middle class and a unifying ideology, all these warring strata, groups and factions were held together by the authority of the Czar, which was sanctioned by the Church and rested on the bureaucracy, the police and the armed forces. The influence of the Church, however, was greatly shattered, the bureaucracy was inefficient, self-concerned, full of internal tension, and not fullheartedly behind the existing regime, and the police were resented by all. The fate of the Czardom therefore depended exclusively upon the discipline and the loyalty of the military.

In such conditions, if the support of the armed forces would fail, both the Czar and the Czardom were doomed. This was well realized not only by the opposition, but by the Czar him-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

in that family, the new circumstances call for more leniency and more intimacy on his part toward his wife and his children. The mother at the same time, because now closer to her husband, is in no need to become over-attached to her children. Such well-balanced family relations come to closely resemble those in the Old-Slavonic family.

It is the children with such close family ties in an emotionally balanced family atmosphere that develop traits of moderation, self-control, responsibility, group orientation and humane feelings. It is in such families that patriotism, idealization of the past and longing for a more humane and more equalitarian political system are nursed.[28] In such families skepticism concerning Bolshevik mythology and opposition to Soviet system may be safely expressed. In such families also religion is cultivated or secretly practiced.[29] In such families apparently numerous anecdotes which ridicule Soviet regime circulate and are spread throughout the Soviet Union.[30] It is to break such family intimacy and solidarity which breed opposition to their regime that the Bolsheviks have shown increasing concern for the control of family relations.

But if the opposition to the Bolshevik regime centers in such families of patriots and humanists, the fate of the Soviet system might rest upon them, in the final analysis. These people might be reluctant to support a Soviet war of aggression led by careerists and fanatics, but ready to defend their Mother Country in the event of hostile aggression from the outside. However, in a war against the Soviet Union which the patriots and the humanists would interpret as a war of liberation from the oppressive, inhuman and destructive policies of Soviet rulers, they might be inclined to take the side of the invading liberators. Inasmuch as such people already find themselves at the fringes of Soviet power structure as specialists and experts in economic management and government administration, in times of crisis the shift of power to these people could easily take place.

Such a trend of development will be even more emphasized among the oppressed, but nationally-conscious minorities, than among the dominant Great-Russians. Millions of Soviet subjects who willingly gave themselves up to the German invaders and